

Please replace the paragraph appearing at page 1, lines 1-7, with the following:

This application is a divisional of commonly assigned United States patent number 6,058,415, application serial number 08/899,953, filed July 24, 1997, entitled "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR INTEGRATION OF COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS WITH COMPUTER-BASED INFORMATION SYSTEMS," priority to which filing date is claimed through related commonly assigned and co-pending United States patent application serial number 09/528,816 filed March 20, 2000, entitled "ONE NUMBER LAN BASED CALENDAR," the disclosures of which are hereby incorporated herein by reference.

Applicant's Record Under § 713.04 of Telephone Interview With Examiner

Applicant respectfully submits the following record of the telephone interview of July 5, 2001, under M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

The following persons participated in the interview: Examiner Bing Bui and Applicant's attorney R. Ross Viguet.

The limitation of claim 1 reciting "a call routing scheme of said call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information" was discussed in reference to the applied reference *King*. Specifically, Applicant's attorney asked the Examiner what structure of *King* was being read to meet the recited call routing system. The Examiner responded that the voice mail system of *King* was a call routing system. Applicant's attorney pointed out that a call routing scheme of the voice mail system of *King* was not modified to route calls as a function of calendaring information. Applicant's attorney pointed out that the calendars of *King* which are updated to show a scheduled call are part of the calendar system of *King* and not the voice mail system. Applicant's attorney further pointed out that updating a calendar to reflect a scheduled time for a call was not modifying a call routing scheme. The Examiner suggested presenting written arguments to

this effect in a response to the Final Office Action for discussion between the Examiner and his supervisor.

Applicant's attorney asked the Examiner whether the features of the dependent claims were considered by the Examiner with reference to *King*. The Examiner responded that, for example, the personal computer of dependent claim 2 was met by *King* because *King* shows the use of software that must be run on a computer. Applicant's attorney asserted that claim 2 requires the calendar information to comprise a data file associated with a calendaring program operable on a personal computer and that it appears that *King* teaches only the use of calendar data on the calendar system of *King* which is not taught or suggested to be a personal computer.

Applicant's attorney asked the Examiner why the rejection of the claims over *King* was under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) when priority has been claimed to a parent case of the present application for which the filing date (July 24, 1997) predates the publication of *King*. The Examiner stated that the cover sheet that he has been given in the prosecution file history only lists priority to the intermediate parent case having a filing date of March 20, 2000, and after contacting the Office help desk was unable to suggest to Applicant's attorney how the Office records may be corrected to properly reflect priority.